State Superintendent of Public Instruction's P-16 Council Closing the Achievement Gap

2007

JACK O'CONNELL
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 5602
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 319-0800

Executive Summary

Mission Statement: To develop, implement, and sustain a specific, ambitious plan that holds the State of California accountable for creating the conditions necessary for closing the Achievement Gap

Much has been said and written about the existence of an **Academic Achievement Gap**, a national educational phenomenon that exists between students who are academically successful, often white or Asian students from economically well-off families, and those who struggle, frequently students from families that struggle economically and who are all too often members of ethnic and racial minority groups or disabled. However, the challenge in closing the achievement gap lies not with identifying *where* the gap exists, but *why*. Therefore, the goals of this plan is to determine why an achievement gap exists and develop a specific roadmap for the state to assist the field to narrow, and eventually eliminate, it so all California's students graduate from high school ready for college, career, and life.

In February 2007, State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) Jack O'Connell announced his intent to lead an effort to find ways to close the achievement gap. The Superintendent's approach to developing and implementing a plan is described in this proposal.

Phase One of the plan calls for extensive information gathering via examining existing research; surveying educators, students, families, and other stakeholders; identifying current exemplary successful practices in California; town hall meetings, community forums, and a statewide Achievement Gap Summit in Sacramento in November 2007. Based on the information gathered in Phase One, the Superintendent will outline his recommendations in his State of Education Address in February 2008.

Phase Two of the plan begins the actualization of the SSPI's recommendations. Activities include conducting policy meetings to discuss recommendations; implementing California Department of Education (CDE)- and SSPI-based recommendations applicable to developing and passing legislative packages and approving regulatory changes; collaborating with the Governor's Office as well as the Legislature for budget appropriations; and conducting further research as needed.

Phase Three focuses on implementation of the SSPI's recommendations, including assuring state budget allocations for programs, implementation plans for chaptered legislation, and organizational changes within the CDE to ensure that all programs and changes are successful.

This plan represents a partnership among the SSPI and CDE; California's P-16 Council composed of a high-level group of leaders from preschool, K-12, higher education, business and philanthropic communities; the University of California (UC); California State University (CSU); and WestEd, a research, development, and service agency that works with education and other communities to promote excellence and achieve educational equity. The role of each agency is described below.

Project Description

A. Need Statement

The achievement gap between white students and other ethnic groups as well as between English Learners and native English Speakers, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Non-disadvantaged students, and Students with Disabilities compared to students without disabilities is a pervasive issue in many, if not all, of California's schools. The intent of this project is to address closing the achievement gap for all students in California's public schools.

The SSPI and California P-16 Council's mission is to promote statewide success across the education continuum, from pre-kindergarten through college and workforce development. To that end, the SSPI will collaborate with a broad-range of stakeholders—namely academic institutions, educational organizations, district administrators, teachers, parents, and branches of the CDE. The success of this project resides in the statewide focus on the problem, and a statewide pool of experts and stakeholders poised to solve it.

California's accountability measure, the Academic Performance Index (API), demonstrates the need for this project. The API measures the academic performance and growth of schools. It is a numeric index that ranges from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. A school's score on the API is an indicator of a school's performance level. The statewide API performance target for all schools is 800. A school's growth is measured by how well it is moving toward or past that goal. Through the use of the API, the stark realities of California's pernicious achievement gap become clear. Chart A below reveals that when looking at "All Grades" in 2006 there is a jarring 166-point gap between California's African American and white students and 145-point gap between Hispanic or Latino and white students. These gaps, and those of all the subgroups highlighted below, are simply unacceptable if California hopes to have a thriving workforce in our increasingly competitive global economy.

Chart A

2006 Base API	All Grades	Grades 2-6	Grades 7-8	Grades 9-11
Overall	721	752	716	683
African American (not of Hispanic origin)	635	677	623	589
American Indian or Alaska Native	691	724	678	659
Asian	847	876	856	807
Filipino	808	846	806	763
Hispanic or Latino	656	690	644	612
Pacific Islander	714	761	704	661
White (not of Hispanic origin)	801	837	803	759
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	654	686	641	607
English Learners	637	676	618	586
Students with Disabilities	518	567	499	456

California's achievement gap is starkly apparent regardless of the accountability system being used. For example, Chart B reports the percentage of students at or above the Proficient Level on the state's criterion referenced test in English-Language Arts in 2006.

Chart B

2006 Percent Proficient	English-Language Arts		
	Grade 4	Grade 7	Grade 10
Overall	49	43	37
African American (not of Hispanic origin)	37	29	22
American Indian or Alaska Native	45	38	34
Asian	73	67	58
Filipino	69	58	51
Hispanic or Latino	35	28	21
Pacific Islander	48	38	29
White (not of Hispanic origin)	69	63	54
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	35	28	21
English Learners	24	9	4
Students with Disabilities	20	11	6

As with the API results displayed in Chart A, Chart B clearly demonstrates that African American, Hispanic, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners and Students with Disabilities lag far behind their white and Asian peers.

<u>Goals and Objectives</u>

This project will focus on the academic disparity between the performance of recognized subgroups in our state and federal accountability systems. It is the clear intention of this project to close California's harmful achievement gap and, to that end, set clear benchmarks in order to assure the state's accountability, as well as to have the ability to reconsider tactics based on outcomes.

Following are the Guiding Principles for this project:

1. We believe that we need to be respectful of different points of view and diverse opinions.

2. We believe that we must stand ready to initiate courageous conversations about difficult topics.

3. We believe that irrespective of race, socioeconomic status, learning disability, or language background, all students can meet proficiency based on appropriate assessments of California's rigorous academic standards.

4. We believe that in order to succeed, we must consider all programs that affect student achievement. For example, we will consider state bureaucracies, county and district practices, and the elimination or redesign of marginally effective practices.

While there are numerous ways to assess the academic achievement of students, using standardized tests provides an objective measure of what students know. Additionally, California's standardized test scores provide a statewide evaluation of the education system. Therefore, the California Standards Tests (CSTs), the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA), the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), and the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) are the selected measures of academic success.

The following parameters will guide the work of the P-16 Council in the upcoming year as they address California's achievement gap:

- We will hold the same high expectations for success of all students and it is our goal that all students will score at proficient or above on all CSTs.

- In order to achieve success, all students must exhibit continuous gains. *(If the high-performing subgroups decrease their performance this would result in a closing of the achievement gap – but not fulfill our intent. It is our intent to continuously improve the progress of all the students while accelerating the achievement rates of the low-performing subgroups.)*

- We will determine success by the continuous and significant narrowing of the gap, which will result in the eventual closing of the gap among all subgroups

as measured by CSTs, CAPA, and CAHSEE.

- For the purpose of our work, we will focus on the academic disparity between the performance of recognized subgroups in our state and federal accountability systems. Therefore, we will focus on the gaps where they exist between:
  - o Ethnic groups
    - The white student subgroup compared to our African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Filipino, Hispanic/Latino, and Pacific Islander subgroups.
      (The intent here is to use the traditional measure of the gap by comparing the academic proficiency of each lower-performing ethnic subgroup to the traditionally higher-performing white subgroup.)

  - o Non-ethnic groups
    - For English Learners (EL), we will focus on the gap through two distinct measures:

      - The gap between current ELs with 5 years or more of schooling in the United States, plus former Els who have been redesignated to Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) to never-ELs including English only (EO) and Initial Fluent English Proficient (IFEP)
        (The intent here is to consider EL progress by comparing CST results of ELs who have had at least 5 years or more of schooling in the United States versus never-ELs on all CSTs. Five years or more of schooling represents a generally accepted threshold level that provides sufficient English-language instruction to allow EL students the opportunity to compete on CSTs with their non-EL counterparts.)
      - The rate at which ELs are redesignated as Fluent English Proficient, currently 9.2 percent per year.

  - o Economically Disadvantaged Students and Non-Economically Disadvantaged Students.

  - o Students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

This project's intent is to build momentum among California students by addressing the achievement gap issue. The goal is clear that all of California's students must be provided not only a quality and equitable education, but that all students have the opportunity to choose their future, whether it is a college education, technical training, career opportunity, or any other path. The goal is that they are not only able to choose, but that they also are allowed the possible option of changing their path, and their educational background would allow them such a choice.

Project Implementation Plan

The SSPI, P-16 Council and the other collaborators on this project are starting with the premise that the major factors inhibiting the learning of all students can be grouped into four major themes known by the acronym ACES:

- **A**ccess – How do all students gain access to what they need? This would include rigorous instruction, highly qualified teachers, extra learning opportunities that supplement the education provided in a typical school day, etc.

- **C**ulture/climate – How can schools offer the best learning environment for all students? Is it a safe place for students to learn? Is it an environment that promotes learning and a sense of belonging for students and school staff? Does it offer student support resources like character education, conflict resolution, and anti-bullying programs? Do effective school-family-community partnerships exist?

- **E**xpectations – Are high expectations for all students and teachers truly held? Is it evident in the curriculum, instructional practices, student assignments, and the school's communication to students, parents, and school staff? Is student progress measured using data and effective instructional strategies?

- **S**trategies – What practices have proven effective (or are promising) for closing the achievement gap? Strategies should address improving the quality of instruction, differentiated instruction, increasing instructional time, teacher collaboration time, reconsidering how to differentiate schools by grade span, etc.

California Partnership
The CDE, in collaboration with the SSPI's P-16 Council, WestEd, and the UC system will undertake an unprecedented research partnership to address the achievement gap. Under the direction of the Office of the President, the UC will make available its world-class research capacity to assist with developing educational solutions for closing the achievement gap. It is the intention of these organizations to form an effective partnership and create a permanent relationship, as well as a national model for collaboration between a university system and a state's K-12 system.

The P-16 Council will coordinate and direct an extensive information gathering process that includes scholarly research, as well as practitioner expertise. Ultimately, the intensive research and analytical work guided by the P-16 Council will form a solid base of knowledge and practice from which a broad-based "roadmap" for closing California's achievement gap will be developed.

The University of California's Role in Research
The four ACES subgroups will direct UC staff and faculty to provide background research materials on specific questions that they pose. In their work, UC researchers will review and synthesize, as appropriate, empirical studies, best practices, meaningful cross-site comparisons, and other materials on aspects of the achievement gap and solutions developed both locally and elsewhere. Where there are important gaps in the literature, UC researchers may conduct additional qualitative and/or quantitative research studies, though only if they can be completed in a timely manner. We anticipate that up to three background papers will be prepared for each of the four subgroups.

The UC research effort will be coordinated and overseen at the Center for Applied Policy in Education (CAP-Ed) at UC Davis. Research faculty and staff at CAP-Ed will work with their counterparts at other UC campuses to assign research topics/questions to appropriate experts. All such studies will be collected/reviewed/approved at CAP-Ed and submitted to the appropriate ACES subgroup.

Achievement Gap Summit
California has the most diverse student population in the nation. It is this growing population that has created numerous and unique educational challenges that contribute to an achievement gap. In light of this issue, the SSPI has additionally called on field practitioners, researchers, school leaders, community leaders, policymakers, and the public to convene the Achievement Gap Summit scheduled for November 13-14, 2007 in Sacramento. More than 4,000 educators are expected to answer the call.

The intent of this working Summit is to create an inclusive, interactive, and collaborative environment of educators across the educational continuum. The Summit will serve the dual purpose of being a place where practitioners gather to share best practices and learn strategies immediately useable to address their daily challenges. Additionally, the Summit will serve as an opportunity for the P-16 Council to lay out their thinking and draft recommendations so as to gain additional feedback before formal recommendations are offered to the SSPI. It is our intention that the Summit will create momentum toward developing systemic change through the sharing of information, two-way conversations, verifying assumptions, and forging partnerships.

After further intensive discussion and supplemental research driven by Summit-generated interest and inquiry, the CDE will develop a comprehensive resource compendium of findings. These findings will be clearly linked to proven, best practice pedagogy and strategies to remove the opportunity barriers that preclude members of various subgroups from attaining higher levels of academic achievement. Ultimately, the intensive, single-focused research and analysis by the CDE will form a solid base of knowledge and practice from which the SSPI,

with advice from the P-16 Council, will develop a model, adaptable "roadmap" for use in closing the achievement gap.

The P-16 Council will provide recommendations to the SSPI that include the requirement of independent action of the SSPI, the introduction of legislation, regulatory changes, and collaboration with other governmental agencies and policymakers.

The timeline, presented below under Project Timeline, allocates a significant amount of time to developing and maintaining partnerships and collaborations with a wide range of stakeholders. It is clearly understood that a strong coalition must be continuously informed of the findings and empowered with the ability for input and recommendations. The intent is not to simply develop a set of recommendations but a statewide consensus for change. By including a wide range of stakeholders throughout the state, and ensuring their knowledge, concerns, and solutions are considered as part of the recommendations, a collaborative effort will be ensured.

The process by which the necessary tasks are to be completed is best described in three phases: Phase One – Recommendations; Phase Two – Actualization of Recommendations; and Phase Three – Implementation of Recommendations. These phases are developed as a way to organize the work and clearly delineate the activities, progress indicators, and target due dates throughout the process. The work on this issue must be continuous. The intention is to build an ongoing process for new ideas and recommendations.

Phase One
This phase includes activities that will serve as resources for the SSPI to consider as possible recommendations as to what the state can do differently to assist the field to close the achievement gap (CTAG). The SSPI will then make legislative, regulatory, and departmental recommendations in his February 2008 State of Education Address. These activities include, but are not limited to: conducting research; focus groups and survey work; meeting with a wide range of stakeholders, government officials, teachers, administrators, and the CDE.

The success of Phase One includes the delivery of certain benchmarks such as: development of a research relationship with the UC system; a collaborative relationship with CSU, including pre-service partnerships around CTAG; identification of stakeholders to carry and advocate for legislation; the inclusion of CTAG as an overall mission for the CDE; delivering a list of recommendations for the SSPI to offer in his February Address; delivery of a legislative and regulatory package for CTAG; and the establishment of ongoing research around the themes of ACES.

Phase Two
This phase begins the actualization of the SSPI's recommendations. These activities include, but are not limited to: conducting policy meetings to discuss recommendations; implementing the CDE- or SSPI-based recommendations; working to pass legislative packages and approve regulatory changes; collaborating with the Governor's Office as well as the Legislature for any necessary budget appropriations. The timeline for Phase Two assumes that further research and discussion will be a part of the SSPI's recommendations, but specific information is dependent on final recommendations.

Phase Three
This phase is the implementation of the SSPI's recommendations. These activities include budgetary funding for programs, implementation plans for chaptered legislation, and a wide range of educational programs coordinated by the CDE to ensure that all programs and changes are successful.

Evaluation Plan

Without question, the importance of accountability and the ability to evaluate the progress of this project is critical. Any belief that this issue can be fully addressed in the first year or two is unrealistic. The need to continually and systematically measure any advances is of extreme value to successfully decreasing the achievement gap.

In the following Project Timeline section, an outline of how the state can annually evaluate progress is provided toward the end of Phase Two. California's statewide assessments provide a systemic way in which to evaluate the education system. While there are numerous ways to assess academic achievement, (and districts may use other measures in addition to the state's assessment programs for the purposes of ensuring consistency) this project will annually review results for the CSTs, CAPA, CELDT, and CAHSEE. Additional data will be reviewed to ensure that students are receiving a rigorous and equitable education throughout the state. The data will include students enrolling and taking higher-level classes, dropout and graduation results, and looking at important indicators for success (e.g. algebra). The evaluation can be outlined in the following ways:

- Review of annual assessment results for gains/losses in test scores of the subgroups in: mathematics, science, English-language arts, science, and history social science.

- Increase/ decrease in the percentage of English-learner students scoring at intermediate or above on the CELDT.

- Increase/ decrease in the percentage of each subgroup enrolled in Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) classes.

- Increase/ decrease in the percentage of students in each subgroup who successfully passed Algebra I.

- Increase/ decrease in the percentage of each subgroup passing the CAHSEE.

- Increase/ decrease in the percentage of each subgroup graduating from high school.

Furthermore, Phase Three's importance cannot be emphasized enough. The implementation of recommendations that are approved through the necessary processes (i.e. legislative, regulatory, policy body, or CDE) is critical. Therefore, conducting annual or, in some cases, biannual update meetings to note progress on implementation and noting any issues that arise will also be critical. This extends past the grant period, but these are necessary steps to ensure the recommendations are realized.

Lastly, as part of the Evaluation Plan, it is necessary to develop a mechanism to receive continual advice on needs and recommendations to pursue regarding necessary changes every year in order to close the gap. This process is included in both Phase Two and Phase Three of the Implementation Plan and Timeline.

Project Timeline

The following timeline is consistent with the description under "Project Implementation Plan" in a previous section. There are three timelines provided, as previously described. These timelines reflect the following:
- Phase One – includes all activities that will serve as resources for providing the SSPI with the best recommendations;
- Phase Two – begins the actualization of the SSPI's recommendations; and
- Phase Three – outlines the implementation of the SSPI's recommendations.

This proposal request support for those Phase I items highlighted in yellow.

Phase One Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
Establish a highly skilled P-16 management, research, and support staff in the CDE	-Hired 6 full-time staff (5 consultants, 1 Office Technician)	June 1, 2007
Establish four component subgroups (i.e. Access, Culture/Climate, Expectations, and Strategies	-Develop draft guiding principles and subcommittee sub-themes	Vetted June 18, 2007

Phase One Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
Hire Executive Director for CTAG	Hire Full Time Director	September 2007
Build a statewide coalition with stakeholders legislators and organizations	-Identify and meet with key stakeholders, legislators and organizations (not limited to) • Governor's Office o Department of Finance • Legislative Leadership • County and District Superintendents • Principals • Teachers • Classified School Personnel • CDE staff	February 2008 (SSPI's State of Education Address)- Ongoing
Collaborate with stakeholders and develop partnerships on identifying issues related to CTAG	-Establish collaborative relationships -Significant issues are identified	February 2008- Ongoing
Council provides topics for UC to produce 8 baseline research papers, 2 per subcommittee	-Subcommittees select issues/ topics related to sub-themes	September 2007
Council provides topics for UC to produce 4 augmented research papers, 1 per subcommittee	-Subcommittees review and discuss papers for approval	November 2007
P-16 Unit: • Coordinate subcommittee meetings	-Independent subcommittee meetings at least monthly	Ongoing monthly throughout all phases
• Conduct broad range of research and program/policy analysis of current literature	P-16 Draft Report October 2007	January 2008 (Final Report)
• Conduct town hall/community meetings throughout the state; host ongoing meetings in Sacramento to partner with members of the education coalition, legislature and hold legislative hearings on the work of the P-16 Council.	-Regional meetings throughout state; with stakeholders at conferences, site visits, etc. - Legislative hearing(s)	June 2007- Phase Three

Phase One Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
• Conduct on-site observations at select district schools and review select county office of education (COE) programs that support local educational agencies (LEAs)	-On site COE master calendar -CDE/P-16 Unit calendar	June 2007-Phase Three
• Conduct meetings with select district, charter and COE schools and classroom educators	-On-site COE master calendar -CDE/P-16 Unit calendar	June 2007-Phase Three
The CDE will: • Internally organize the work of CDE around shared priority to CTAG • Hire firm to conduct preliminary research through polling and focus groups • Firm convene focus groups, and informational hearings and/or discussion roundtable for and within all areas of the state • Firm conducts surveys with schools sites and districts	Various meetings with CDE staff -Search for firms -Allow for bids -Select contractor -Finalize contract	June 2007-Phase Three
Prepare baseline report on Achievement Gap	Review annual STAR Results to determine: -Subgroup scores in mathematics, science, English language arts, and history/social science.	October 2007
P-16 Council provide preliminary recommendations on areas to SSPI can begin to consider		Sept. 2007
Host Summit in Sacramento (4000+ attendees)		November 13-14, 2007
Statewide follow-up activities to CTAG Summit	-Public conversations about recommendations -Contact others for guidance on follow-up activities	November 2007-June 2008

Phase One Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
	-Sharing information	
CDE & WestEd review Field Surveys, Summit outcomes, research summaries and prepare draft recommendations	Draft recommendations	December 2007
P-16 Council reviews and comments on draft recommendations	P-16 subcommittee meetings and general P-16 Council meeting	January 2008
SSPI delivers State of Education Address with P-16 recommendations and actions	-State of Education Address	February 2008
Coordinate and conduct extensive vetting of P-16 recommendations with key stakeholders including but not limited to: • Governor's Office o Department of Finance • Legislative Leadership • County and District Superintendents • Principals • Teachers • Classified School Personnel • CDE staff	-Results of findings from vetting process with key stakeholder groups including, but not limited to surveys, focus groups, town hall meetings and stakeholder group roundtables	June 2008 (Ongoing)

Phase Two Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
Statewide follow-up activity to CTAG Summit • Review information shared from CTAG Summit • Share information, literature, research, and best practices with the field	-Gather information from Summit -Analyze and synthesize data collected -Establish a plan for follow-up activities from the Summit recommendations	-Final report by October 2008 -Share with field October 2008 – Phase III

Phase Two Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
Follow-up meetings with CDE to discuss implementation stages of SSPI recommendations	-Meet with Chief Deputy Superintendent, Branch Deputy Superintendents, Division Directors, and their respective staff members	February 2008-Phase Three
Coordinate and conduct extensive vetting of SSPI recommendations with key stakeholders including but not limited to: • Governor's Office • Dept of Finance • Legislative Leadership • County and District Superintendents • Principals • Teachers • Non Classified School Personnel • UC • CSU • CDE staff	-Introduction of legislative package -Budget recommendations included in state budget for 2008 and 2009. -Submittal of any regulatory changes.	February 2008-Phase Three
Develop legislative package	-SSPI approves legislative package	February 2008-Phase Three
Meeting with legislative members and stakeholders to advocate for legislative package	-Meetings throughout each legislative session	Ongoing through Phase Three
Continue vetting process via regional town hall meetings, legislative hearings, etc to: • Garner new ideas, strategies, and best practices • Elicit feedback regarding the ongoing work of the P-16 Council		February 2008-Phase Three

Phase Two Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
Contracted research firm to continue to conduct polling and focus groups activities based on the SSPI's recommendations / legislative package • Firm convene focus groups, and informational hearings and/or discussion roundtable for and within all areas of the state • Conduct surveys with school sites and districts	-Contract renewed -Information analyzed, and synthesized -Results posted on CDE Web site	October 2008
Sustain and expand collaborative efforts with stakeholders on identifying issues related to CTAG • P-12 • CSU • UC • Private Universities • Business sector	-Key stakeholders submit CTAG identified issues to P-16 staff for additional P-16 Council consideration and recommendations	February 2008-Phase Three
P-16 Unit elicits feedback from the P-16 Council regarding: • Additional research needs for further evaluation for CTAG • Collaborative efforts with UC to identify further research topics. • Stakeholder identified issues	-P-16 staff develops draft list of specific research issues for Council's approval	Topics identified in June 2008 and December 2008
CDE staff briefs P-16 Council on test score results (CAHSEE, CELDT, CSTs, CAPA) and legislative measures related to CTAG	P-16 Council e-mail update and/or P-16 Council meeting agenda items	August 2008
Consider additional input concerning SSPI Achievement Gap recommendations for: • Introducing new legislative bills as appropriate • Implementing recommendations via the Legislative Initiative or state regulation process as applicable • Implementing P-16 recommended policy change strategies	Develop legislative package Begin regulation change process as applicable	December 2008 and 2009 June 2008
CDE and P-16 Council review and	-CAHSEE, CST Results – August	Ongoing

Phase Two Activities	Progress Indicators	Target Due Date
consider recommendations based on CAHSEE, CELDT, and CST data	2008 and 2009 -CELDT – initial assessments November 2007 and 2008; annual assessments April 2008 and 2009	through Phase Three
End-of-year assessment to determine success and direction of CDE efforts to CTAG	-Review of annual assessment results for gains/losses in test scores of the subgroups in: mathematics, science, English-language arts, science, and history social science. -Increase/ decrease in the percentage of English learner students scoring at intermediate or above on the CELDT. -Increase/ decrease in the percentage of students in each subgroup enrolled in AP and IB classes. -Increase/ decrease in the percentage of students in each subgroup who successfully passed Algebra I. -Increase/ decrease in the percentage of students in each subgroup passing the CAHSEE. -Increase in the percentage of students in each subgroup graduating from high school.	August 2008 and 2009 August 2008 and 2009 August 2008 and 2009 August 2008 and 2009 August 2008 and 2009 August 2008 and 2009

Phase Three Activities	Progress Indicator	Target Due Date
Implement regulatory changes as outlined by SSPI's adopted recommendations	-Submit recommended changes to SBE May 2008	November 2008
CDE staff works with field to provide quality technical assistance around Chaptered Legislation	-CDE's internal system developed to provide technical assistance to the field (e.g. grant applications, proposals.)	January 1, 2009 and every January 1 so long as

Phase Three Activities	Progress Indicator	Target Due Date
		legislation is chaptered.
Recommend appropriate activities for Year 4 as it applies to CTAG	-Feedback from P-16 Council, stakeholders, CSU, UC, P-12 administrators, teachers, parents, and students	April 2009

Organizational Capacity

The CDE and the California P-16 Council will both play instrumental roles in ensuring the success of this project. As mentioned previously, the P-16 Council is a high-level group of leaders from the preschool community, K-12, higher education, business, and philanthropy.

The goals of the Superintendent's California P-16 Council are to:

1. Improve student achievement at all levels and eliminate the achievement gap.
2. Link all education levels, preschool, elementary, middle, high school, and higher education, to create a comprehensive, seamless system of student learning.
3. Ensure that all students have access to caring and qualified teachers.
4. Increase public awareness of the link between an educated citizenry and a healthy economy.

In order to assist the P-16 Council, the SSPI has committed resources and personnel which include a new branch and a new P-16 Unit. These combined resources of experience, time, and financial support ensure that there will be consistent attention provided to this project.

In addition, WestEd, a research, development, and service agency that works with education and other communities to promote excellence and achieve educational equity will serve as a key partner for this project.

The University of California's role is to provide the project with a solid and accessible foundation of research information that can be used by the SSPI and CDE, P-16 Council, and Summit participants as starting points for their exploration of solutions to the many complexities of the achievement gap. We believe that having a common set of background studies and information will serve as a critical starting point for the conversations, and will make the work of

designing specific strategies to close the achievement gap more productive in the months to come.

There are many important questions about schools and schooling, and the achievement gap in particular, that remain poorly studied. Indeed, the relative lack of financial resources to study basic educational issues is well known and of concern. Even so, with a solid marshalling of the research currently available, the Superintendent, CDE staff, and Summit participants working with the P-16 Council, will be able to debate the most notable factors impacting achievement, and come to consensus on a course of action.

Sustainability

The CDE, in conjunction with the California P-16 Council, will both serve instrumental roles in ensuring the sustainability of this project. Since its inception in 2004, the P-16 Council has been charged with examining ways to improve student achievement at all levels and to link preschool, elementary, middle, high school, and higher education to create a comprehensive, integrated system of student learning. Similar councils have successfully improved achievement in 19 other states.

The P-16 Council is a committed group of 52 members all of whom are dedicated to improving the state's education system. It represents a wide range of experts throughout California, including teachers, administrators, parents, business leaders, students, and academics.

Past P-16 assignments included the topic of High School Reform, to which the SSPI sponsored a successful, two-day High School Summit at the Sacramento Convention Center that attracted more than 4,000 attendees.

Without hesitation, the SSPI, the CDE, WestEd, the UC and the P-16 Council are fundamentally committed to making certain that this important project continues. The fact that Phase Two and Phase Three continue beyond the first year is an indication of the commitment for a continued focus on the critical issue of the achievement gap.

Appendix A

P-16 Council Members

Name	Title	Organization
Ackerman, Arlene	Superintendent	San Francisco Unified School District
Allen, Carrie	Principal	Claremont High School, Claremont Unified School District
Alonzo, Richard	Superintendent	Los Angeles Unified School District, Local District 4

Name	Title	Organization
Atkin, Catherine	President	Preschool California
Barbara, Manny	Superintendent	Oak Grove School District, San Jose
Bogue-Feinour, Carol	Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs	California Community Colleges
Canter, Marlene	President, Board of Education	Los Angeles Unified School District
Chu, Dorothy	Teacher	Montebello Unified School District
Clifton-Bacon, Sandy	Adjunct Professor	Concordia University, Irvine
D'Amico, Judy	Member, Board of Directors	Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
Davis, Shelley	Director	California GEAR UP
Dilday, Jim	Principal	Curtis Middle School, San Bernardino Unified School District
Fischer, Herb	Superintendent	San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools
Guardino, Carl	President and CEO	Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Hart, Gary	Founder, CSU Institute for Education Reform	California State University, Sacramento
Hasson, Dián	Teacher	Butte College
Hudson, Bob	Superintendent	Alpaugh Unified School District, Tulare County
Hume, Wyatt	Provost and Executive Vice President	University of California, Office of the President
Jackson, Bill	President and CEO	Great Schools, Inc.
Jones, Allison	Assistant Vice Chancellor	California State University, Office of the Chancellor
Katzman, Carol	Former Board Member	California State Board of Education
King, Michael	Director, Education Industry	IBM Corporation
Lansing, Sherry	Regent	University of California
Levine, Harold	Dean, School of Education	University of California, Davis
Loss, Jo	Vice President	California State Parent Teacher Association
Martel, Patti	Principal	George Moscone Elementary, San Francisco Unified School District
Mendoza, Juan	Student	California State University, Sacramento
Meno, Lionel	Dean, College of Education	San Diego State University
Munitz, Barry (Chair)	Trustee Professor	California State University, Los Angeles
Murphy, Stanley	Teacher of the Year	San Diego High School, San Diego Unified School District
Murray, Linda	Superintendent in	Ed Trust West

Name	Title	Organization
	Residence	
Nguyen-Lam, KimOanh	Board Member	Garden Grove Unified School District
Núñez, Fabian	Speaker	California State Assembly
Penry, Martha	Director, Area A	California School Employees Association
Perata, Don	Majority Leader	California State Senate
Plotkin, Scott	Executive Director	California School Boards Association
Rava Treat, Carol	Senior Policy Officer for Education	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Rios-Kravitz, Rhonda	Librarian	California State University, Sacramento
Ross, Barbara	Strategic Relations Manager	Apple Computer, Inc
Siegel, Alan	Teacher of the Year	W.C. Carlé Continuation High School, Konocti Unified School District
Siri, Diane	Superintendent	Santa Cruz County Office of Education/ ARCHES
Stanton, Anne	Director of Youth Programs	James Irvine Foundation
Stevens, Carroll	Senior Fellow, Foundation Legacy Development	Stupski Foundation
Stewart, Jack	President	California Manufacturers and Technology Association
Tacheny, Suzanne	Former Board Member	California State Board of Education
Thorp, Peter	Senior Vice President	California Charter Schools Association
Tomlinson-Keasey, Carol	Chancellor	University of California, Merced
Vaught, Kendall Ann	Teacher	Oak Middle School, Los Alamitos Unified School District
Victorin, Virginia	Vice President, Corporate and Employee Giving	Washington Mutual
Washington, Curtis	Teacher	San Mateo Union High School District
Whitebook, Marcy	Director	Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley
Wright, Joyce	Assistant Superintendent	Sacramento County Office of Education

Appendix B

P-16 Council

Since its inception in 2004, the State Superintendent's California P-16 Council has been charged with examining ways to improve student achievement at all levels and to link preschool, elementary, middle, high school, and higher education to create a comprehensive, integrated system of student learning. Similar councils have successfully improved achievement in 19 other states.
The goals of the Superintendent's California P-16 Council are to:

- Improve student achievement at all levels and eliminate the achievement gap.
- Link all education levels, preschool, elementary, middle, high school, and higher education, to create a comprehensive, seamless system of student learning.
- Ensure that all students have access to caring and qualified teachers.
- Increase public awareness of the link between an educated citizenry and a healthy economy.

The Council is a committed group of 52 members all of whom are dedicated to improving the state's educational system. They represent a wide range of experts throughout California, including teachers, administrators, parents, business leaders, students, and academics. All members of the Council attend plenary sessions and subcommittee meetings that are held between the plenary sessions. The first plenary session was held on May 17, 2005.

To conduct its work, the Council members are assigned to subcommittees. For this project there are four subcommittees, each charged with exploring a different aspect of the Achievement Gap. The four subcommittees are: Achievement, Relevance, Culture/Climate, Expectations, and Strategies: ARCES for short. Each subcommittee is asked to explore research-based strategies and solutions that will lead to changes in public policy. The subcommittees research the best practices, review state and national data, seek public input, and rigorously discuss issues, policies, and strategies related to their assignment. This work yields research-based recommendations to be presented to the entire Council and documented in a subcommittee report. From this report the full Council develops final recommendations that are submitted the SSPI for review.

Past P-16 Council assignments included High School Reform, from which the State Superintendent sponsored a successful, two-day High School Summit at the Sacramento Convention Center, attracting more than 4,000 attendees. The High School Reform Final Report and Recommendations are available on the CDE Web site at: www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/pc/hsreformrptrecomnd.asp